

AN ALARMING EXPOSURE.

Nothing pertaining to educational systems and methods that has appeared in recent times so seriously challenges public interest as does an article in the May number of the *Cosmopolitan*, written by Harold Bolce, and entitled, "Blasting at the Rock of Ages." It deals with the character of teaching which prevails in many universities and colleges in the departments of sociology, ethics and religion.

As an evidence of the extent and the thoroughness of his investigation, the writer says: "To discover the scope and daring of college teaching in the United States today, I have undertaken an itinerary of classrooms from Cambridge to California. Some of the institutions I have entered as a special student. In others I have attended lectures as a visitor, or interviewed members of the faculty, or consulted typewritten or pointed records or what they teach. In these ways my course has included, Harvard, Yale, Princeton, the University of Pennsylvania, George Washington University, William and Mary College (where Thomas Jefferson and other founders of the republic studied), the University of Chicago, Columbia University, Syracuse University and the University of California. What I came upon in the teachings of these universities, with what I obtained additionally from presidents, deans and professors of Northwestern University, New York University, the University of Iowa, the University of Wisconsin, the University of Nebraska, Union College, Cornell, Brown University and Leland Stanford University, constitutes a profound surprise, a series, in fact, of increasing surprises—absorbing and sensational."

In a prefatory note, as indicating the trend of Mr. Bolce's article, the editor of the *Cosmopolitan* says:

"Out of the curricula of American colleges a dynamic movement is upheaving ancient foundations and promising a way for revolutionary thought and life. Those who are now in close touch with the great colleges of the country will be astonished to learn the creeds being fostered by the faculties of our great universities. In hundreds of class-rooms it is being taught daily that the decalogue is no more sacred than a syllabus; that the home as an institution is doomed; that there are no absolute evils; that immorality is simply an act in contravention of society's accepted standards; that democracy is a failure and the Declaration of Independence only spectacular rhetoric; that the change from one religion to another is like getting a new hat; that moral precepts are passing shibboleths; that conceptions of right and wrong are as unstable as styles of dress; that wide stairways are open between social levels, but that to the climber children are incumbrances; that the sole effect of profligacy is to fill tiny graves; and that there can be and are holier alliances without the marriage bond than within it."

Of the contents of Mr. Bolce's article, the "United Presbyterian" says: "It would be like the ranting of some visionary, if the statements were not backed up by proofs." The article bears every indication of being true and trustworthy—more's the shame, more's the disgrace to the institutions where these conditions prevail."

In his summing of the teaching which he encountered, the author says: "The lectures take you along a course lined with none of the immemorial landmarks. The Church does not count. To accept the teaching of any hierarchy is like looking for light and life in the grave." "Conscience cannot show the way; in one age it approved burning at the stake. Democracy has been the mirage of modern nations. It is a theme for suave declamatory statesmanship; and the home, once the cradle of the race, has become the breeding place of woe, ignorance, inefficiency and debt. The professors even suggest and outline a substitute for the modern home." "They teach young men and women plainly that an immoral act is merely one contrary to the prevailing conceptions of society, and that the daring ones who defy the code do not offend any Deity, but simply arouse the venom of the majority—the majority that has not yet grasped the new idea."

We may quote but few of many astounding assertions made by lecturers in these universities. The students of Harvard are taught that "there are no absolute evils. The highest ethical life consists at all times in breaking the rules that have become too narrow." Professor Blackmar, of the Kansas University, says: "Standards of right perpetually change in social life." Professor Sumner, of Yale, teaches that both pair, marriage and democracy, are produced by the conditions of society, and both are transitory," and that "concubinage may be expected to arise again"; that "ethical notions are mere figments of speculation," "unrealities that ought to be discarded altogether." Professor Charles Zueblin, of Chicago University, says: "There can be and are holier alliances without the marriage bond than within it." "Every normal man or woman has room for more than one person in his heart." Professor Giddings, of Columbia University, says: "It is not right to set up a technical legal relationship . . . as morally superior to spontaneous preference of a man and woman." Shailer Matthews, of Chicago University, says: "Much of our current literature shows a certain deterioration of the Christian idea of the family. Our literature is becoming anti-family; it minimizes its sanctity. We go into the family relation with the same 'sang-froid' that we go on a picnic." Professor Zueblin, of the same university, says: "Like politics and religion, we have taken it for granted that the marriage relationship is right and have not questioned it."

The attitude of these men on morals in general is likewise anarchistic. Professor Sumner, of Yale, "takes the view that the majority can make anything right." "Anything tolerated by the world in general is right." Mr. Bolce says of this professor that "he has devoted a large part of his university career to proving that there is no such thing as God-given and unchangeable morality." "The notion that there is anything fundamentally correct implies the existence of a standard outside and above usage, and no such standard exists." "An ethical ideal no group ever had, and if it pretended to have one, it would be a humbug."

For revealed religion a similar contempt is displayed. The author informs us that "religion as explained by Lester Frank Ward merely invents supernatural pen-